

corps? Why should not the nurse corps be organized on the same lines as any other corps in the army? It is the establishment of a difference between *enlisted nurses* and *other enlisted soldiers* that we resent.

Why may not the superintendent of a general hospital or the head nurse of a ward be recognized as on equal social footing with the wife of a captain or of a lieutenant?

From Mrs. Kinney's sentence at the close of her paragraph about the "great gulf" one would suppose that there was a choice of associates permitted the nurse from *either* side of the gulf, but not from *both* sides. This is misleading. The writer has it from the lips of an officer's wife that they, the officers' wives, have no association whatever with the women of the nurse corps—not any more than they have with the wives of privates. This is the social side that we resent. No class of people recognize and understand the "great gulf" between officers and others better than nurses, who are brought up to it from their first days as probationers to their graduating day, the difference of a few hours in seniority sometimes fixing a "gulf" quite as wide as would be fixed by the difference of a year; but we cannot see why officers of the nurse corps may not associate with other officers or with their wives—nor can we see why there should be no "officers of the nurse corps." There is the matter in a nut shell.

Not that nurses are caring so much for such association, because most nurses in the army are too busy to think much about whether they may or may not have it; but when they are brought up to face the fact that they *may not* they resent it and want the principle of right in the matter recognized. The argument about rank in Australia is answered by Canada's recent act.

That is a pretty plea about many "truly loving country" and "caring more for what they give than what they receive," but it contrasts badly with the advantages of the service held out by Mrs. Kinney. What really patriotic nurse enlists for a "trip around the world" or to have "easy patients to care for"?

EVANSTON, ILL.

V. P.

[We are of the opinion that this writer has touched a vitally important point in the situation.—ED.]

DEAR EDITOR: Permit me to accept your challenge and to testify to that which I know and have seen. I would urge upon all other nurses, particularly those "who feel so strongly that the present status of army nurses is intolerable" to speak out. Now is the accepted time to make

known the cause of their dissatisfaction, or else forever after hold their peace.

As one who has had four years of continuous service the writer feels that she is one of those who may be said to "know whereof she speaks." To say members of the Army Nurse Corps are considered as "ranking with the common soldier" or that any conditions (the status of the nurses or anything else) are "intolerable" is certainly untrue. That some things might be bettered no one denies, but to make such sweeping statements as are above quoted is a manifest injustice to the nurse corps as a body, the individuals who compose it, and most of all to those graduate nurses all over the country who know of the nurse corps only what they read in the magazines.

I was a member of the Army Nurse Corps from April 22, 1902, until July 5, 1906, and was discharged at my own request. Not for one instant during that time was I ever classed with the enlisted men. On the contrary, I received every courtesy and consideration from the Commanding General down through all grades of other line and staff officers. If there are nurses who have been treated otherwise I say without hesitation the cause lay with themselves, and the fault was their own.

After an absence of eight months, part of the time spent in a civil hospital, I am only waiting a vacancy to be reappointed to the dear old nurse corps of the United States Army.—"With all thy faults I love thee still."

KEOTA, IOWA.

MARIE RIORDAN

DEAR EDITOR: In your editorial in the March issue of the JOURNAL you state that the status of the army nurse is intolerable.

I have been a member of the Army Nurse Corps for five years and fail to see how such a term could be applied to the position of the army nurse. Apparently a large number of nurses now in the corps are of the same opinion, as there are many who have been in the service from three to eight years. Why do they remain if what you state be true?

They are excellent nurses and women who have had a wide professional experience. It is not reasonable to suppose that they are so disinterested as to remain for years in the corps to their own disadvantage.

Many leave at the expiration of three years, go home for a rest, and to see their people, and return, after a few months of civil life.

To my mind, your statement is hardly consistent with the above facts.

DORA E. THOMPSON, R.N.,
Chief Nurse, United States Army.

Presidio of San Francisco.